



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/659,456	09/11/2000	Yoji Okazaki	Q58705	5835
7590 10/02/2003			EXAMINER	
Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC			NGUYEN, JOSEPH H	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037-3202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1700-			
Advisory Action	09/659,456	OKAZAKI ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph Nguyen	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most partner adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant? 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	•					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,28-36 and 55-58</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10-27 and)				
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exan	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	-{ -·/				
10. Other:		EDDIE I EE				
	CIDEDING	EDDIE LEE ORY PATENT EXAMI	NER			
		OLOGY CENTER 280				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that nowhere in any of the references is there any teaching of using InGaN material for emitting an excitation light as recited in amended claims 1 and 28. However, Ishikawa et al teaches using an InGaN material for emitting an excitation light (col. 16, lines 26-34). The combination of Mooriadian et al and Ishikawa et al would read on the claimed invention since it must be recognized that any judgement on obviousness is in any sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the Applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. In re Mclaughlin, 443, F.2d 1392; 70 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971)